

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,882	12/20/2004	Anteo Pelliconi	MI 6029 (US)	5313
34872 BASELL USA	7590 11/01/2007 INC.		EXAM	INER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY 912 APPLETON ROAD			NUTTER, NATHAN M	
ELKTON, MD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			·····	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/518,882	PELLICONI ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Nathan M. Nutter	1796		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 October 2007</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Dispositi	Disposition of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers				
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachmen	t(s)				
2) Notice	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 10-07	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

In response to the amendment filed 5 October 2007, the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, is hereby expressly withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriya et al (US 6,214,934), is hereby expressly withdrawn.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1796

Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/499,182 (US 2006/0047071). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compositions are identically claimed. Claims 1, 7 and 10 recite melt flow rates, intrinsic viscosity values and monomer ratios that would be embraced by the reference compositions, as shown by the reference claims 2-5.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/518,692 (US 2006/0041072). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compositional limitations overlap and include identical elements as recited herein having identical physical characteristics. Manipulation of the compositional limitations is within the skill of the artisan.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5 October 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to the provisional rejection of claims 1-9 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/499,182 (US 2006/0047071) Pelliconi et al, no

Terminal Disclaimer has been filed to overcome the rejection.

With regard to the provisional rejection of claims 1-9 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of copending Application No. 10/518,692 (US 2006/0041072), Pelliconi et al, no Terminal Disclaimer has been filed to overcome the rejection.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan M. Nutter whose telephone number is 571-272-1076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 1796

706 .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nathan M. Nutter Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796

nmn

29 October 2007